

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed April 15, 2008 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Status and Amendment to the Claims

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-33, 36-40, 42-43, 45-46, and 48-88 are now pending.

No claims stand allowed.

Claims 13-30 have been withdrawn from consideration as the result of an earlier restriction requirement.

Claims 1, 6, 31, 36, 43, 45, 46, 48, 55, 58, 61, 63, 65, 67, 69, 71, 73, and 75 have been amended to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. Support for these changes may be found in the specification, figures, and claims as originally filed.

Independent claims 1, 6, 43, 45, 55, and 61 have been amended to recite in part a polling routine configured to poll each of possible USB device adapters connected to the network in accordance with a candidate list, and compile a master list of only the possible USB device adapters which responded to the polling and are therefore currently capable of establishing a connection over the network, wherein the candidate list is initially configured with one or more possible USB device adapters. (emphasis added) Support for these changes may be found in the specification, figures, and claims as originally filed, for example the specification at page 12 lines 9-21 and FIG. 6.

Independent claims 31, 36, 46, 48, 58, and 63 have been amended to recite in part a polling routine configured to poll each of possible USB device adapters connected to the network

in accordance with a candidate list, and compile a master list of only the possible serial data bus device adapters which responded to the polling and are therefore currently capable of establishing a connection over the network, wherein the candidate list is initially configured with one or more possible serial data bus device adapters. (emphasis added) Support for these changes may be found in the specification, figures, and claims as originally filed, for example the specification at page 12 lines 9-21 and FIG. 6.

Claims 4-5, 34-35, 44, and 47 were previously cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

New claims 77-88 have been added, which also particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. Support for these claims may be found in the specification, figures, and claims as originally filed, for example the specification at page 14 line 21 to page 15 line 2.

In view of the Examiner's earlier restriction requirement, the Applicants retain the right to present claims 13-30 in a divisional Application.

Record of Interviews

On July 24, 2008, an interview was conducted by telephone between Examiner Strange and the undersigned. The Applicants thank the Examiner for granting this interview. The details of the interview are set forth in the Interview Summary document made of record.

On July 31, 2008, another interview was conducted by telephone between Examiner Strange and the undersigned. The Applicants thank the Examiner for granting this additional interview. The details of the interview are set forth in the Interview Summary document made of record.

Objections to the Claims

Claim 1 stands objected to for various informalities.¹ With this Amendment, Claim 1 has been amended accordingly. Withdrawal of the Objection to Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

The First 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-3, 31-33, 43, 46, 51, 53 and 55-64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ben-Dor et al.² in view of Gonno.³ among which claims 1, 31, 43, 46, 55, 58, 61, and 63 are independent claims.

According to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.),

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in the applicant's disclosure.⁴

Independent Claims 1, 31, 43, 46, 55, 58, 61, and 63

With this Amendment, independent claims 1, 43, 45, 55, and 61 have been amended to recite in part a polling routine configured to poll each of possible USB device adapters connected to the network in accordance with a candidate list, and compile a master list of only the possible USB device adapters which responded to the polling and are therefore currently capable of establishing a connection over the network, wherein the candidate list is initially configured with one or more possible USB device adapters. (emphasis added) Support for these changes may be

¹ Office Action mailed April 15, 2008, at ¶ 5.

² U.S. Publication No. 2002/0141418 to Ben-Dor et al.

³ U.S. Patent No. 6,404,739 to Gonno.

⁴ M.P.E.P. § 2143.

found in the specification, figures, and claims as originally filed, for example the specification at page 12 lines 9-21 and FIG. 6. The cited art of record does not teach or suggest all claim limitations in independent claims 1, 43, 45, 55, and 61 as presently amended. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claims 1, 43, 45, 55, and 61 is unsupported by the cited art of record and the rejection must be withdrawn.

Also with this Amendment, independent claims 31, 46, 58, and 63 have been amended to recite in part a polling routine configured to poll each of possible USB device adapters connected to the network in accordance with a candidate list, and compile a master list of only the possible serial data bus device adapters which responded to the polling and are therefore currently capable of establishing a connection over the network, wherein the candidate list is initially configured with one or more possible serial data bus device adapters. (emphasis added) Support for these changes may be found in the specification, figures, and claims as originally filed, for example the specification at page 12 lines 9-21 and FIG. 6. The cited art of record does not teach or suggest all claim limitations in independent claims 31, 46, 58, and 63 as presently amended. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claims 31, 46, 58, and 63 is unsupported by the cited art of record and the rejection must be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-3, 32-33, 51, 53, 56-57, 59-60, 62, and 64

Claims 2-3 depend from Claim 1. Claims 32-33 depend from Claim 31. Claim 51 depends from Claim 43. Claim 53 depends from Claim 46. Claims 56-57 depend from Claim 55. Claims 59-60 depend from Claim 58. Claim 62 depends from Claim 61. Claim 64 depends from Claim 63. Claims 1, 31, 43, 46, 55, 58, 61, and 63 being allowable, Claims 2-3, 32-33, 51, 53, 56-57, 59-60, 62, and 64 must also be allowable for at least the same reasons as for Claims 1, 31, 43, 46, 55, 58, 61, and 63.

The Second 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 6-10, 12, 36-40, 42, 45, 48-50, 52, and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ben-Dor et al. in view of Gonno, and further in view of Krishnan,⁵ among which Claims 6, 36, 45, and 48 are independent claims.⁶

Independent Claims 6, 36, 45, and 48

With this Amendment, independent claims 6 and 45 have been amended to recite in part a polling routine configured to poll each of possible USB device adapters connected to the network in accordance with a candidate list, and compile a master list of only the possible USB device adapters which responded to the polling and are therefore currently capable of establishing a connection over the network, wherein the candidate list is initially configured with one or more possible USB device adapters. (emphasis added) Support for these changes may be found in the specification, figures, and claims as originally filed, for example the specification at page 12 lines 9-21 and FIG. 6. The cited art of record does not teach or suggest all claim limitations in independent claims 6 and 45 as presently amended. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claims 6 and 45 is unsupported by the cited art of record and the rejection must be withdrawn.

Also with this Amendment, independent claims 36 and 48 have been amended to recite in part a polling routine configured to poll each of possible USB device adapters connected to the network in accordance with a candidate list, and compile a master list of only the possible serial data bus device adapters which responded to the polling and are therefore currently capable of establishing a connection over the network, wherein the candidate list is initially configured with one or more possible serial data bus device adapters. (emphasis added) Support for these

⁵ U.S. Patent No. 6,157,950 to Krishnan.

changes may be found in the specification, figures, and claims as originally filed, for example the specification at page 12 lines 9-21 and FIG. 6. The cited art of record does not teach or suggest all claim limitations in independent claims 36 and 48 as presently amended. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claims 36 and 48 is unsupported by the cited art of record and the rejection must be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 7-10, 12, 37-40, 42, 49-50, 52, and 54

Claims 7-10, 12, and 49 depend from Claim 6. Claims 37-40, 42, and 50 depend from Claim 36. Claim 52 depends from Claim 45. Claim 54 depends from Claim 48. Claims 6, 36, 45, and 48 being allowable, Claims 7-10, 12, 37-40, 42, 49-50, 52, and 54 must also be allowable for at least the same reasons as for Claims 6, 36, 45, and 48.

The Third 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 11 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ben-Dor et al., in view of Gonno, further in view of Krishnan, and further in view of Gottfurcht et al.,⁷ among which no claims are independent claims.⁸

Claim 11 depends from Claim 6. Claim 41 depends from Claim 36. As mentioned above, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection of Claims 6 and 36 based on Ben-Dor et al. in view of Gonno and further in view of Krishnan is unsupported by the cited art of record because Ben-Dor et al. in view of Gonno and further in view of Krishnan does not teach all claim limitations. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection of dependent claims 11 and 41 based on Ben-Dor et al.

⁶ Office Action at ¶ 17.

⁷ U.S. Patent No. 6,611,881 to Gottfurcht et al.

⁸ Office Action at ¶ 27.

in view of Gonno, further in view of Krishnan and further in view of Gottfurcht et al. is also unsupported by the cited art of record.

The Fourth 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 65-76 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ben-Dor et al. in view of Gonno, and further in view of Official Notice, among which no claims are independent claims.⁹

Claims 65-68 and 73-76

Claims 65-66 depend from Claim 1. Claims 67-68 depend from Claim 31. Claims 73-74 depend from Claim 55. Claims 76-76 depend from Claim 58. As mentioned above, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection of Claims 1, 31, 55, and 58 based on Ben-Dor et al. in view of Gonno is unsupported by the cited art of record because Ben-Dor et al. in view of Gonno does not teach or suggest all claim limitations. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection of dependent claims 65-68 and 73-76 based on Ben-Dor et al. in view of Gonno and further in view of Official Notice is also unsupported by the cited art of record.

Claims 69-72

Claims 69-70 depend from Claim 6. Claims 71-72 depend from Claim 36. As mentioned above, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection of Claims 6 and 36 based on Ben-Dor et al. in view of Gonno is unsupported by the cited art of record because Ben-Dor et al. in view of Gonno, and further in view of Krishnan does not teach or suggest all claim limitations. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection of dependent claims 65-68 based on Ben-Dor et al. in view of Gonno, and further in view of Official Notice does not teach or suggest all claim limitations. Therefore,

the 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection of dependent claims 69-72 based on Ben-Dor et al. in view of Gonno and further in view of Official Notice is also unsupported by the cited art of record.

Additionally, the Examiner contends the system disclosed by Ben-Dor et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, but fails to disclose how the candidate list is configured.¹⁰ However, Claim 6 defines an Internet gateway comprising a port for connecting to the Internet, and a universal serial bus (USB) remote host control driver. And Claim 36 defines an Internet gateway comprising a port for connecting to the Internet, and a serial data bus remote host control driver. As admitted by the Examiner, Ben-Dor et al. in view of Gonno fails to disclose an Internet gateway comprising a serial data bus remote host control driver.¹¹ Nor has the Examiner taken Official Notice regarding this claim limitation. Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of Claims 69-72 based on Ben-Dor et al. in view of Gonno and further in view of Official Notice is unsupported by the art listed by the Examiner and the rejection must be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

⁹ Office Action at ¶ 29.

¹⁰ Office Action at ¶ 30.

¹¹ Office Action at ¶ 18.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.


The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID BROWN
RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP

Dated: August 15, 2008



John P. Schaub
Reg. No. 42,125

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040